Univerzita Karlova v Praze
Pedagogická fakulta

The Clash of Innate vs. Consensual Ethics in George Orwell's 1984 and Jeanette Winterson's Oranges Are Not the Only Fruit

Jan Kučera

Katedra anglického jazyka a literatury

Vedoucí bakalářské práce: PhDr. Petr Chalupský, Ph.D.
Studijní program: Specializace v pedagogice PG – AJ

2015

Prohlašuji, že jsem bakalářskou práci na téma Střet vnitřní a zvnitřněné etiky v *Oranges Are Not the Only Fruit* Jeanette Wintersonové a *1984* George Orwella vypracoval(a) pod vedením vedoucího bakalářské práce samostatně za použití v práci uvedených pramenů a literatury. Dále prohlašuji, že tato bakalářská práce nebyla využita k získání jiného nebo stejného titulu.

I hereby declare that I have written the I have written the bachelor thesis on the Clash of Innate vs. Consensual Ethics in George Orwell's 1984 and Jeanette Winterson's Oranges Are Not the Only Fruit all by myself and all the sources used during writing were properly cited.

Datum

.....

podpis

Na tomto místě bych chtěl poděkovat vedoucímu své bakalářské práce, PhDr. Petru Chalupskému, Ph.D. za nesmírnou ochotu, pomoc a trpělivost při vzniku práce. Chtěl bych také poděkovat Mgr. Jakubu Ženíškovi za prvotní usměrnění práce. Bez Vás by tato práce nemohla vzniknout.

I would like to thank the supervisor of this thesis PhDr. Petr Chalupský, Ph.D. for his extraordinary willingness, guidance, and patience during the formation of this thesis. I would also like to thank Mgr. Jakub Ženíšek for the initial pointing in the right direction. Without you think thesis could never have been created.

.....

podpis

NÁZEV:

Střet vnitřní a zvnitřněné etiky v Oranges Are Not the Only Fruit Jeanette Wintersonové a 1984 George Orwella

AUTOR:

Jan Kučera

KATEDRA (ÚSTAV)

Katedra anglického jazyka a literatury

VEDOUCÍ PRÁCE:

PhDr. Petr Chalupský, Ph.D.

ABSTRAKT:

Tato práce se zaměřuje na vystavění typologie probíhající historií západního myšlení a bádání. Střet je ve vnímání morality a etiky na jedné straně jako něčeho vnitřního, samozřejmě přítomného v přirozenosti člověka, na druhé straně jako něčeho do člověka vloženého z vnějšku. Základním východiskem je tvrzení, že mezi těmito dvěma proudy existuje rozdíl, který se během běhu staletí stal tradičním. V teoretické části bude tato dichotomie demonstrována na příkladech filosofů a učenců, kteří se tématem zabývali nebo zabývají (Kant, Harris, Hobbes apod.). V praktické části se potom zaměříme na srovnání dvou děl moderní britské literatury, která se tématem zabývají ze zásadně rozdílných, ovšem i nápadně podobných hledisek; „1984" George Orwella a "Oranges Are Not the Only Fruit" Jeanette Wintersonové.

KLÍČOVÁ SLOVA:

Orwell, Winterson, moralita, etika, vnitřní, zvnitřněná

TITLE:

The Clash of Innate vs. Consensual Ethics in George Orwell's 1984 and Jeanette Winterson's Oranges Are Not the Only Fruit

AUTHOR:

Jan Kučera

DEPARTMENT:

The Department of English Laguage and Literature

SUPERVISOR:

PhDr. Petr Chalupský, Ph.D.

ABSTRACT:

This thesis focuses on establishing a typology running throughout the history of Western thought and enquiry. The clash of morality and ethics perceived on the one hand as something innate, intrinsically present in the nature of a human being, on the other as something implanted into the human. The initial assumption is that there is such a distinction between the two streams and, over the centuries, it has become a traditional one. Theoretically, this divide will be demonstrated by using various examples of philosophers and scholars who delved or have delved into the matter at hand (Kant, Harris, Hobbes etc.), while the final comparison will work with two pieces of modern British literature, dealing with the matter from profoundly different, yet strikingly similar points of view; George Orwell's "1984" and Jeanette Winterson's "Oranges Are Not the Only Fruit".

KEYWORDS:

Orwell, Winterson, morality, ethics, clash, innate, consensual

Table of Contents

1. Introduction....7
2. Theoretical Part....8
2.1 The Question of Morality....8
2.2 The Clash....9
2.3 Immanuel Kant: Moral Philosophy....10
2.4 Thomas Hobbes: Natural Morality....12
2.5 The Bible: Divine Morality and Wisdom....13
2.6 R.W. Emerson: Personal Moral Compass....14
2.7 Sam Harris: Science as the source of Morality....16
2.8 Summary....17
3. Practical Part....19
3.1 Protagonists....19
3.2 Environment....23
3.3 Antagonists....28
3.4 Brainwashing techniques....30
4. Conclusion....33
Works Cited:....35

1. Introduction

The topic of morality has been chosen by the author for multiple reasons. Firstly, the question being virtually irresolvable remains extremely tempting. On the one hand, questions of morality tend not to be in the centre of focus today, while more practical or pragmatic approaches are stressed. At the same time, morality and ethics is a topic with actually no firm basis, as a strongly skeptical attitude has to be faced whenever such a topic is brought to light. Such a skeptic attitude seems logical, and the further inquiry into the topic will show that it is not a simple task to try and get to any solid answers.

The thesis does not work with any certain premise. The only default position of the author is that a major clash in understanding of what the source of morality ethics is an obvious part of any philosophical, scientific, and artistic endeavor. The aim of this work is not to choose a side or come up with a new approach, but to demonstrate that the aforementioned clash is visible and very much present in the 20th century British literature.

The books chosen for the practical part of the thesis have not been chosen by accident. Both *1984* (1949) and *Oranges Are Not the Only Fruit* (1985) show a number of considerably similar features: be it the character and position of the main protagonist (both Jeanette and Winston find themselves caught in the midst of a mass unable or not willing to sum up an individual thought), the hostility and a complete lack of understanding from their environment (any sign of individuality is either openly criminalized or perceived as an act of an enemy), the brainwashing techniques used by the antagonist, and the personas of the antagonists themselves (the individual thought is by the society interpreted as sinful, criminal, intrinsically wrong).

The first part of the thesis is focused on a set of exemplary philosophers, scholars, and writers chosen from the wide range of Humanities in general. Their views will help us establish a sense of comprehension in the field of Western inquiry into morality and ethics. Later, the chosen pieces of British literature will be discussed in detail. Cited parts as well as a description of the overall essence of the books will demonstrate the patterns needed to distinguish between different approaches to morality represented by various characters in the story, similarities and differences between the books.

2. Theoretical Part

2.1 The Question of Morality

For millennia, questions of morality and ethics have been central points of human inquiry. Is there morality? Why do we consider certain thoughts and deeds moral and others immoral? Is morality rooted in the bestial basis of the human being, or is it a mental construct? Does the issue correspond with the great questions of theology? To what extent is this topic connected to God, the existence and non-existence of such an entity? And ultimately, where does the notion of ethics and morality come from? Is it an inseparable, axiomatic part of how a human being is constructed, or is it a mere concept brought upon an individual by the pressure of society?

It would appear the topic is completely inescapable, as virtually all areas of Humanities have been exploring the area; be it philosophy, a discipline most obviously dealing with such categories, psychology, perceiving the Self as subject matter itself, religion, based almost solely on whence the Right and Wrong come, what Deity imposes what laws on people and the world, and also an area which will be dissected most in this work, but also literature, as it best mirrors what is happening on the inside of a human, yet without an explicit need of a scientific apparatus and terminology.

Lately, even science has been exceeding beyond the boundaries of mere understanding of how things work and authors such as Richard Dawkins (evolutionary biologist) or Sam Harris (neurologist, cited later) have been discussing the topic of ethics and morality, asking quite similar questions as mentioned above, yet considering the answers from a very different point of view.

2.2 The Clash

Let us at this point suppose that there are two opposing sides, or stances. One that states that morality and ethics of a human being are innate, inborn, a firm part of a human being. The other would then state that it is hardly so, and that conversely, a human is born as a *tabula rasa*, meaning nothing about the being is inborn, at least when considering matters of the psyche, and whatever the person learns about morality is merely a list of internalized demands of society.

Obviously, such a distinction is extreme, just like both of the opposing poles. In the 21st century, scarcely would we ever find a psychologist who would claim that the issue may be addressed in either one or the other manner. Yet, the aim of this work is not to choose one and declare it to be true. The clash has been present for a very long time, and as such mirrored in literature many times. The goal of this thesis is to show with a very narrow set of examples how varied the approach towards the issue is and how even in British literature of the 20th century it is still present.

Several very distinct authors and their respective pieces, that have no firm connection with each other whatsoever, have thus been chosen to demonstrate that scholars and writers with very different backgrounds and with very different goals tend to comment on morality and ethics. To keep in line with the succession established previously, let us first focus on philosophy. At this stage, it would hardly be possible to cite the Greek giants. Also, since the focus of the work as a whole is modern Western literature, it is preferable for us to choose an author modern and influential enough to demonstrate a solid, widely known, and important point of view.

The logical course of action now is to try and pick such authors who represent distinctive or even extreme attitudes and points of view. An ideal representative of moral philosophy is Immanuel Kant, whose emphasis on moral choices is notorious. Another philosopher chosen for this thesis is Thomas Hobbes who compares morality and ethics to natural laws, and thus creates an interesting polemic with Kant. Outside of Europe, R.W. Emerson with his great stress on individuality and Sam Harris with firm belief in science have been chosen to provide us with very distinctive sets of attitudes and opinions. All of those will be discussed in the light of the Bible, traditionally understood to be the highest

giver of moral truths in the Western philosophical and theological discourse.

The order of authors and works is not chronological but thematic. We will start with our attention turned to philosophy and religion, and with respect to the Bible move towards those who most vocally reject its teachings.

2.3 Immanuel Kant: Moral Philosophy

The German philosopher Immanuel Kant focused great parts of his work on the topic of morality. His views will help us a great deal in establishing the background of the thesis. Most adept scholars are familiar with his Categorical Imperative, alarmingly similar to the so called Golden Rule of not doing unto others what one wishes not to be done unto him/her. Yet, the prerequisite for such a moral statement is wider.

The basic form of Kant's formula (The Formula of Universal Law) is stated as follows: "Act only in accordance with that maxim through which you can at the same time will that it become a universal law" (Kant 19). Pushing the rule a step further, Kant later adds The Formula of the Law of Nature: ''So act as if the maxim of your action were to become through your will a universal law of nature'' (Kant 19). Both formulas focus on the will. The individual accepts the responsibility of theoretically, yet willingly, forcing the will upon everyone, or everything. In order for Good to be there in the world, the will logically needs to be good.

In his *Groundwork for the Metaphysics of Morals* (1785), Kant addresses the issue of morality. Firstly, we need to understand how Kant sees the range of good will: "There is nothing it is possible to think of anywhere in the world, or indeed anything at all outside it, that can be held to be good without limitation, excepting only a good will" (Kant 28). Good will is not physical in any way, therefore it is not bound to anything, chained by any other phenomenon. The character of will then (volition, willingness) allows one to distribute it freely.

It would then seem that good will is rooted fully in the individual. The question remains what good will is and how the distinction between good and evil is described. Kant supposes the goodness of will is by no means dependent on the outcome of an act caused by

the will. “The good will is good not through what it effects or accomplishes, not through its efficacy for attaining any intended end, but only through its willing, i.e., good in itself“ (Kant 29). It should be now obvious that goodness or badness is not in itself connected with any phenomenon or entity present in the physical world. To further support the claim, Kant adds: “Utility or fruitlessness can neither add to nor subtract anything from this worth“ (Kant 29).

So, Kant’s goodness of the individual will lies somewhere behind (or before) the factual outcome of an act. It does not come as a surprise that this claim works perfectly in line with the aforementioned formulas: “I ask myself only: Can you will also that your maxim should become a universal law? If not, then it is reprehensible“ (Kant 38). No action should thus be taken by an agent for its own sake.

Kant’s understanding of the topic inevitably appears ambivalent, as the individuality is quite as important as the universality of the goodness. It is safe to say that Kant wants to see a society consisting of individually functioning persons each following principles of a total, universal good. The question remains whether the good can ever be universal, since it would not seem quite likely that all should agree upon what is good for all.

Is it the human intellect that could help us in this case? Surprisingly enough, it is not. Kant does not make a connection between the intellect (or wisdom) of a person and their goodness. Later in the *Groundwork*, he states simply: ”I need no well-informed shrewdness to know what I have to do in order to make my volition morally good“ (Kant 38). The central point of a person’s goodness lies somewhere else. Goodness is not an actual volitional process. A person understands that an act is good in itself, yet is in no way require to reflect on it intellectually.

Finally, let us note that Immanuel Kant understood the goodness of one’s will as something individual, buried deep inside one’s individuality, free of any connection with one’s wit or any practical effect. The goodness works as a completely independent phenomenon.

2.4 Thomas Hobbes: Natural Morality

A very different view is held by the 17th century English philosopher Thomas Hobbes. In his *Leviathan* (1651) he established the idea of the social contract. However, what shall interest us most is his image of moral philosophy derived from the laws of nature. The very basis of this logic is set as follows: "The laws of nature are immutable and eternal; for injustice, ingratitude, arrogance, pride, iniquity, acceptation of persons, and the rest can never be made lawful. For it can never be that war shall preserve life, and peace destroy it" (Hobbes 138). Hobbes claims that living according to these laws, which are in themselves natural, not given by Man, means living morally. Just as any other phenomenon is mirrored in science, these laws are too. As he adds, "the science of them is the true and only moral philosophy. For moral philosophy is nothing else but the science of what is good and evil in the conversation and society of mankind" (Hobbes 139). Here we have perhaps the very first notion of morality and ethics seen as a subject matter for scientific inquiry. We shall see a bit later that this is a topic very much alive with the likes of the American neurologist Sam Harris.

Hobbes also stresses that different situations may affect profoundly the understanding of good and evil in one human being. He establishes the state of "mere nature" as the state of a human being without any additional layer composed of social habits, or patterns of understanding. In the state of "mere nature" all humans agree upon the categories of good and evil. Simply put in his words, the means of good (or peace) are "justice, gratitude, modesty, equity, mercy, and the rest of the laws of nature, are good; that is to say, moral virtues; and their contrary vices, evil" (Hobbes 139). According to Hobbes, there is a general understanding of what is good (moral) and evil (immoral) among all humans derived from the very laws of nature, thus such an understanding is not socially determined of man-made. As mentioned above, the laws of morality can be inquired into in quite the same manner as physics or any other scientific discipline, for "the science of virtue and vice is moral philosophy; and therefore the true doctrine of the laws of nature is the true moral philosophy" (Hobbes 139). So it would seem that from investigating nature in itself we can derive the truth of what is clearly good and clearly bad.

2.5 The Bible: Divine Morality and Wisdom

Perhaps the strongest authority on the topic of goodness and badness, or the clash of morality originating in Man or outside, is represented by the Bible. It is not a simple task looking for passages explicitly expressing what the point of view represented in the Scripture is. Furthermore, the Bible is highly contradictory. Many interpreters suggest it is crucial to understand the message, overall feeling of the Scripture as a whole rather than cherry-pick certain quotes which (seemingly) contradict each other. Since one of the discussed books in this thesis is deeply concerned with religious zeal, it would be advisable to try and find some relevant passages from the Bible nevertheless.

Both the Old and New Testaments distinguish between what is of Man and what is of God. The proportion of each is incomparable: e.g. “Because the foolishness of God is wiser than men; and the weakness of God is stronger than men“ (King James Version, Cor 1:25). Living roughly at the same time as the late Greek philosophers seeking human wisdom of the greatest depth, the followers of the Hebrew theology had to clarify where the difference lies.

It needs to be understood that within the context of the Bible, wisdom is not only knowledge but it also carries a tint of inner goodness. The Old Testament book of Ecclesiastes states: “Then said I, Wisdom is better than strength: nevertheless the poor man's wisdom is despised, and his words are not heard. The words of wise men are heard in quiet more than the cry of him that ruleth among fools. Wisdom is better than weapons of war: but one sinner destroyeth much good. (Eccl 9:16-18). Yet even earlier in the same book, it is said that “in much wisdom is much grief: and he that increaseth knowledge increaseth sorrow” (Eccl 1:18).

According to these remarks, seeking wisdom (of Man) is undoubtedly better a goal than seeking power and strength of a weapon, yet the search in itself is nothing unless it is governed by the Lord. Total obedience to the will of God is the cornerstone of all Abrahamic religions. Any idea or act based solely on the will of a human being alone is futile and sinful. “Do not be wise in your own eyes; fear the Lord and shun evil,” (Prv 3:7) says King Solomon in the Old Testament.

Even Jesus Christ himself (through the words of the evangelist Matthew) stresses that

what is in Man is filthy when attacked for not cleaning hands before eating: “But those things which proceed out of the mouth come forth from the heart; and they defile the man. For out of the heart proceed evil thoughts, murders, adulteries, fornications, thefts, false witness, blasphemies” (Mat 15:18-19). Throughout the New Testament, one of the most important stances of Jesus is the filthiness of Man’s mind and soul, the inescapable sinfulness of all humanity. Nothing but the Creation is holy about a human being. Any thought, act or wish unfiltered through the search for God’s Grace is thus self-idolatry and filth.

Yet, perhaps the most important persona for conservative Protestant Christians is Saul of Taurus (or St Paul). His Epistles set the more practical outlook of Christianity as a religion. In many places, he warns against too much trust in ourselves, our wisdom. In Colossians, he states as follows: “My purpose is that they may be encouraged in heart and united in love, so that they may have the full riches of complete understanding, in order that they may know the mystery of God, namely, Christ, in whom are hidden all the treasures of wisdom and knowledge” (Col 2:2-3).

To even further support the claim, James offers a fruitful passage: ”If any of you lacks wisdom, he should ask God, who gives generously to all without finding fault, and it will be given to him” (Jas 1:5). It should be clear now that in the context of Protestant Christianity (one of which most prominent characteristics is full dependence on the Scripture and strong antipathy towards the Catholic tradition) mental capacities of a single human being are willingly put down, while the wisdom of God (represented by the Bible, the Church, the Community) is put on a pedestal. We shall see later on how this can be used to manipulate a person.

2.6 R.W. Emerson: Personal Moral Compass

One author of American literature stands out when it comes to the topic of individuality and individual morality. We have seen that within the ranks of Christian and biblical morality, it is only God and the Scripture that hold any authority. The American transcendentalist Ralph Waldo Emerson understands the issue completely conversely. Let us shortly focus on

his *Self-Reliance* (1888).

Emerson's highest point of morality is self-dependent, honest point of view. As he says "to believe your own thought, to believe that what is true for you in your private heart is true for all men, — that is genius" (Emerson). He means to express that human beings should only believe things to be true that come from themselves. He even takes it a step further when he claims the following: "What have I to do with the sacredness of traditions, if I live wholly from within? my friend suggested, — "But these impulses may be from below, not from above." I replied, "They do not seem to me to be such; but if I am the Devil's child, I will live then from the Devil." No law can be sacred to me but that of my nature" (Emerson). In Emerson's point of view, a man must stay true only to himself, even if it be seen as diabolical. It is easy to say that what comes from the man, comes from the devil – as many evangelical, conservative churches put it. Later on, we shall see that both discussed books work exactly with this kind of quasi-logic based on radical, literal interpretation of the Scripture, or a similar, founding text.

In Emerson, the mentality of society is the antagonist, hostile to the individual self of a person. As he puts it, "society is a joint-stock company, in which the members agree, for the better securing of his bread to each shareholder, to surrender the liberty and culture of the eater" (Emerson). Emerson says that society wants individuals not to be truly individual but rather unthinking cells of a centralized organ. Further, "The virtue in most request is conformity. Self-reliance is its aversion" (Emerson). Society wants all its members to be the same. A shadow agreement is present, as it is highly uncomfortable for the society to have individualists in its midst.

Only with uniformity and lack of individual thought can we have a society of those who have exchanged their personal freedoms for a sense of security. And such a state of things can only be prolonged through stagnation. Emerson states that a consistent mind can never be great, yet, at the same time, an inconsistent, great one shall always be misunderstood. Such a mind, obviously, is quite the counterpart of a religious one. In his words, "a foolish consistency is the hobgoblin of little minds, adored by little statesmen and philosophers and divines. With consistency a great soul has simply nothing to do" (Emerson). We will later see with both protagonists, but mainly with Jeanette in *Oranges*,

that the misunderstanding is extremely prominent a prerequisite for the hostility on the part of the surrounding society. As Emerson puts it, "to be great is to be misunderstood" (Emerson).

2.7 Sam Harris: Science as the source of Morality

Another very important and rather modern interpretation of the topic of ethics comes from the so called New Atheist movement, pioneered by a group of prominent scientists and philosophers, probably one of most vocal of whom is Sam Harris, the American neurobiologist and popularizer of science. In his latest book *The Moral Landscape* (2010) he tries to explain that science is not only a tool of explaining factual reality but the very basis for morality in humans. As he clarifies, "people who draw their worldview from religion generally believe that moral truth exists, but only because God has woven it into the very fabric of reality" (Harris 8). Harris warns against the nonsensical duality in understanding the moral reality of life when he stresses that for most people "science is the best authority on the workings of the physical universe, religion is the best authority on meaning, values, morality, and the good life" (Harris 11). His lifelong goal is to show that religion (or God) is not a source of anything because it is simply flawed. It is important to point out that the New Atheist movement has two basic goals: firstly it is to promote science as the ultimate source of understanding all aspects of human life, secondly it is to completely destroy religion. Consequently, Harris aims to prove that science will fill the blank space left by the destruction of religion. Quite like his colleagues within the New Atheist movement, he supposes scientific research can now or will be able in the future to answer even the questions we considers matters of faith. "Rational, open-ended, honest inquiry has always been the true source of insight into such processes. Faith, if it is ever right about anything, is right by accident" (Harris 11). Harris thus suggests that even if one gets to the core of a problem correctly through one's faith, it is always merely by accident, since faith is not a mental operation with any sort of achievement.

Harris also claims that morality is an implicit part of scientific inquiry. In *the Moral Landscape*, he notes: "Just as there is no such thing as Christian physics or Muslim algebra,

we will see that there is no such thing as Christian or Muslim morality. Indeed, I will argue that morality should be considered an undeveloped branch of science" (Harris 10). He even sees a future of a branch of science concerned with morality and mind, as he clarifies: "There are right and wrong answers to moral questions, just as there are right and wrong answers to questions of physics, and such answers may one day fall within reach of the maturing sciences of mind" (Harris 24). Such a radical stance is not mentioned here in order to be supported or refuted. It is important for us to see that extremely opposite poles exist within the range of the topic of innate vs. external morality of Man.

Perhaps the last important point to be made here using Harris' words is this: "Because most religions conceive of morality as a matter of being obedient to the word of God (generally for the sake of receiving a supernatural reward), their precepts often have nothing to do with maximizing well-being in this world" (Harris 46). Logically, nothing a religious person does automatically increases the good in this world. The supernatural notion of good could then easily contradict what we consider good here and now. It could easily be the very opposite. We will later see that this shift in meaning bends the understanding of what is good profoundly. What is perceived as good by an individual here and now can easily be played down by the argument of some sort of higher principle, most noble goal that a mere human cannot fathom. Harris, of course, warns avidly against such notions.

2.8 Summary

As has been demonstrated above, the topic of good vs evil, morality vs immorality, ethics and its origin has always been present in the thinking of the Western culture. It would be quite too daring to try and say there is one universal answer as to where the notion of morality comes from. It needs to be pointed out repeatedly that the aim of this work is not to find such an answer but merely to show that the clash between different understandings is constant and quite prominent.

With the set of chosen representatives of different branches of inquiry and their views, it should be easier for us to understand that there exists an underlying pattern of investigating the topic. With respect to the set of ideas enumerated above, it will be easier for us to understand that the two selected pieces of modern British literature are yet another contributions to the discourse of morality and ethics.

While Kant provides us with an idea of inner goodness free of connection with intellect, or goodness which is good in itself, Hobbes' understanding presents the categories of good and evil as something quite as natural as laws of nature. Both assume that the goodness or badness of a thought or act is good or bad independently. What it means is that it is not important to know what the effect of a concrete thought or act is to decide whether it is good or bad. In both Kant and Hobbes we see that such categories are not social constructs and society does not create the goodness and badness in people. In addition, according to Hobbes people as a whole understand the true meaning of goodness and badness in their most natural state. Given the situation of an individual caught in an environment based on a manmade, given set of truths, the ultimate verity of what is good would not become relative, no matter how harsh the circumstances, not matter how strong the pressure on such an individual.

Emerson offers us a different approach. The central point of morality in a human being is located in the very being. With Emerson, there is no general understanding of goodness, no goodness in itself but most definitely it is not given by society. An individual chooses the course of action personally. Emerson takes into account the existence of a Deity but it does not necessarily have authority over the moral choices of an individual. If the moral majority or even the church decides that the actions of a person are immoral and contrary to God's plans, then it is quite reasonable for the person to side with the Devil, if the moral code of the Devil is identical with the personal understanding of good and evil. In Emerson's view, nothing precedes the individual moral choices of a human being, not even the ideas of a god.

In many ways, Emerson's point of view is in direct contrast with the teachings of the Bible. Where he stresses individuality, the Scripture stresses God's authority. Where Emerson teaches conscience and individual will, the Bible preaches obedience. While in

Emerson wisdom comes from the person, in both Testaments the only true wisdom is always with God. Consequently, anything that emerges in the person alone is automatically rotten, sinful, and filthy. Although there is no single correct interpretation of the Scripture as a whole, the overall essence of the book is rooted in complete dedication to the Word, selflessness, compliance, and repentance.

Finally, Sam Harris rejects the authority of a book, religion, or even faith completely. While in some respect his view may be parallel to Emerson, as both would agree that morality is hardly a product of a god, Harris does not necessarily perceive it as something fully personal or individual. One of interpretations of his approach may be that he simply replaces religion/faith with science. Which, to some extent, is true. Harris argues that nothing ever comes out of faith that makes any sense unless it is by accident. Conversely, science does not operate with accidents but only postulate what has been subject to experiment. Ultimately, Harris provides us with an extremely antireligious, atheist, fully secular view when he suggests that morality and ethics are not relative, not fully individual, but also not given by a supernatural being. Science, he claims, can and will give us definite answers as to what is moral, immoral, good, and evil. In a supposed clash of an individual with the surrounding society, no laws, no personal understanding, no supernatural truth will help either side, since science can give us the ultimate, unquestioned answer.

3. Practical Part

3.1 Protagonists

The practical part of this thesis will be focusing on the main protagonists of the two books as wells as their surrounding worlds, and the friction created by their maladaptation to its patterns and rules. While it may be pointed out that their starting situation is different, the outcome in both cases is very similar: the environment does not want or try to understand or in any way accept the two renegades. Both Jeanette in *Oranges* and Winston in *1984* find themselves in the position of rebels they never willingly wanted to become, leading small

revolts internally rather than publicly, yet misunderstood and condemned.

In both books we are facing an individual finding him or herself completely alienated, alone in a world that seems strange and hostile. In neither case does the protagonist choose to attack the system with no good cause. These are not stories of outright rebels. The clash of understanding of what is and is not ethical comes from the lack of communication between the protagonist and the surrounding society. It is also important to stress out that what is perceived as sinful, devinat or criminal by the majority seems logical, natural to the protagonist. In both cases, the hero fails to grasp the reason for the hostility on the part of the majority, even though to a certain extent they succeed in seeing behind the rhetoric of the opponent.

As Zimbardo puts it, in *1984* we encounter "the reluctant hero Winston Smith, who stands against the omnipotence of the Nineteen Eighty-Four version of the System". (128) The word reluctant is very important for us as it best helps us understand who Winston Smith is. He finds himself in a position of a person wondering how nonsensical the system can actually be. The absurdity is too obvious. Winston often contemplates the possibility of being alone in this realisation, but he is too afraid and predominantly too reluctant to try to talk to anybody.

In *Oranges*, the protagonist is Jeanette, a teenage girl growing up in an ultraconservative Protestant Christian family in a small working English town. Quite like Winston she finds herself in the midst of a very tightly bound, centrally controlled society. Series of misunderstandings show her clearly she is unable to function within the Christian community, as no matter how deep her actual faith, she is not able to cope with the structuralized religion best represented mother. At the same time, her bringing up renders her unfit to function properly among everyday British citizens, which is mostly demonstrated in her growing confusion at school. Thus, Jeanette ends up quite lost and alone, too.

To further support the similarity of the two protagonists, let us emphasize the anti-social aspect of both. With Winston, it is the freethinking very early on in the story ignited in his mind. Also his poor health, lack of commitment and visibly worn-out façade makes him partially unwillingly step out of the crowd of the society of *1984*. With Jeanette, we

suspect something is different about her, but only later in the book do we learn explicitly that it is her lesbianism, in the circles of radical Christianity absolutely tabooed and condemned, that makes her the ultimate outcast.

Yet, while Orwell spends a considerable amount of time and space in the book on Winston, his thought processes and descriptions of his character, it is not quite as simple to dissect the character of Jeanette in *Oranges*. We learn that she is well used to following prescribed rules (prayer, complete abstinence, no worldly pleasures etc.), as her life revolves around her mother's interpretation of the Scripture, church attending, hymn singing, and spending most of her time amid the community. Any sign of those rules not working perfectly at all times, she, just like any other member of the surrounding community, feels uneasy: "Since I was born I had assumed that the world ran on very simple lines, like a larger version of our church. Now I was finding that even the church was sometimes confused. This was a problem" (18). Growing up in an atmosphere of total obedience, following given rules, never asking too many questions, and most importantly, never getting too many answers, even the slightest weakness, uncertainty or hesitation is felt strongly.

And thus while Winston, even though reluctant to act on his imaginations, is seen from the very beginning of the book as skeptical, Jeanette remains confused, naïve, and almost gullible. However, later on in both stories the impact of a much stronger figure becomes more apparent, as both protagonists tend to blindly follow those who finally shift their fate into whatever future they have got prepared for them.

Jeanette's mother cannot bear a child, or refuses to beget one, so she adopts Jeanette. As Winterson puts it: "She would get a child, train it, build it, dedicate it to the Lord: a missionary child, a servant of God, a blessing" (6). To the mother, Jeanette is her "child from the Lord" (6). This setting pre-sets Jeanette's throughout the rest of the story. Ellam points out that "the central relationship in the text is between Jeanette and her mother, whose commitment to evangelism leaves her uninvolved with Jeanette's development and intolerant of her daughter's sexuality" (364). The position of the daughter is always connected with the mother's religion. The relationship is fully filtered through the lens of religion, and whenever Jeanette tries to reach her mother on a more civil, intimate level, she

fails.

Jeanette herself does not feel or act the same way. She is at all times drawn back to her mother, not matter how weak the actual emotional link between the two. The situation dramatizes when Jeanette falls in love with Melanie, a girl she meets. Although she herself does not fully understand what has happened and somehow supposes the two of them are in a way special friends, she feels nervous around Melanie. Because she wants to relate to her mother, she wants to share this new feeling with her which, of course, is problematic. The issue reveals itself as follows: “I talked about her all the time at home, and my mother never responded“ (68). Jeanette’s mother does not acknowledge the newly discovered feeling as something beautiful, as would have happened had the case been of heterosexual love, and finally tries to talk Jeanette out of it.

It does not come as a surprise that throughout the book Jeanette escapes into various phantasies. Some of the most difficult issues are addressed by way of similes and parables. One that will help us best at this stage is the story of the sorceress Winnet towards the end of the book. She, quite like Jeanette, is drawn to a parental figure, in this case the sorcerer. “You'll never get out of this forest without me” (105). The dependency of the young girl is apparent at the very beginning of the sub-story, as well as further on when she is cast away: “`Daughter, you have disgraced me,' said the sorcerer, `and I have no more use for you. You must leave’” (110).

The notion of being drawn to a central, almost omnipotent person is also prominent in the case of Winston Smith. Similarly to Jeanette, he is haunted by his imagination and, similarly, it is not clear to what extent these are mere dreams and phantasies as, finally, they are firmly connected to the content of the actual story. More than once, Winston is visited by O’Brien, his Nemesis, in dreams. “He knew that sooner or later he would obey O’Brien’s summons” (201). Winston very well realizes that he will not be able not to succumb to the temptation of O’Brien’s power and a strange form of appeal.

Later on in the story, when Winston is finally caught and tortured on the basis of his “thoughtcrime”, it is revealed that “it was O’Brien who was directing everything” (308). No matter how gravely irrational the system and logic behind the Party and the overall functioning of society may seem to Winston, no matter how deeply he considers himself

rational (e.g. as he writes in his secret diary: “Freedom is the freedom to say that two plus two make four. If that is granted, all else follows” (103).), he cannot resist the temptation of going to the parental figure of O’Brien.

Even though this passage of the thesis has not shown us the moral or ethical choices of the protagonists explicitly, it should be clearer what type of personality we are facing. While the two worlds in which Jeanette and Winston find themselves may not seem comparable at first, they show some undoubtedly strong similarities, and the protagonists do as well. Both are in some sense weak personalities surrounded by aggressive, authoritarian systems with no respect to the personal feelings or need of the individual. Both start to see flaws of the system, both rebel not by explicit choice but by following the course of thought and action that they consider natural. In the case of Winston, this rebellion is conscious, Jeanette being a teenager simply lets her life flow, which under given circumstances in enough to become controversial and later becomes confrontational.

3.2 Environment

The protagonists are situated in certain worlds, environments surrounding them. We will not turn our attention to how these environments function in shaping the psychological profiles of the protagonists and how they are constructed. As was mentioned before, both Winston and Jeanette live in authoritarian, extremely unfree, tight societies not welcoming any kind of peculiarity or distinction. It is almost impossible for them to have any creative role in shaping their surroundings. Let us now focus on some common points of both worlds presented in *1984* and *Oranges*.

Firstly, it is important to note that authoritarian systems rise from a collapse of a preceding system, and often its the dysfunction as a direct prerequisite for its own flourishing. The more prominent the dysfunction of the preceding environment (in our case the pre-war country and the family), the more strict is the newly established system in which we find the protagonists. Such a situation creates space for uncertainty, absence of direction, lack of security. That of course is a perfect spot for a strong, leading figure to emerge and rise to power. In *1984* both the prerequisite and the rise of authoritarian rule is

obvious and undisputed, yet in *Oranges* it may not appear so.

While in *1984* we learn, although but vaguely, about the cruel war in which most of what the world used to be came to end, Winterson presents a picture of a partially dysfunctional family with a clearly dominant figure of the mother and a weak father somewhere in the background. A father so weak that he plays virtually no role in the actual story. In both cases we may trace a collapse of tradition replaced by something much more radical and strong. We may argue that in an English family, Christian values are nothing uncommon, yet the presented form of evangelical religion in *Oranges* is hardly the form most English families are used to. At the same time, the father figure fails to take its place, and so the mother steps in with fervor and vigor strong enough for both parents. Another additional point may be the adoption of Jeanette. It further adds to the unusual situation of the family. In Orwell's world, greed, selfishness and capitalist values of the old world (or in a sense our world) plunge the global population into an extremely destructive and painful war, the outcome of which, based upon terror, fear, but also an effort not to ever have to go through such a conflict again, is the universe of Ingsoc (the official ideology of *1984*'s realm). In other words, the Western tradition of the 20th century combination of capitalism and democracy had failed before the Party and the Big Brother rose to power.

With the assumption that there are two totalitarian regimes at hand, an outright dictatorship in *1984* and a theocracy represented by the mother and the zealous community in *Oranges*, we may proceed to another crucial point in maintaining the functionality of such a system. It is the shift in language which subsequently shifts human thinking. Orwell explains the principles of Newspeak, the perfect example of such a shift, in the Appendix to *1984* concerned solely with language as follows: "The purpose of Newspeak was not only to provide a medium of expression for the world-view and mental habits proper to the devotees of Ingsoc, but to make all other modes of thought impossible" (376-7). Orwell further explains that "a heretical thought—that is, a thought diverging from the principles of Ingsoc—should be literally unthinkable, at least so far as thought is dependent on words" (377). Similar principles are used in the Christian community in *Oranges*. The strongest prominence is then given to the words "holy" and "unholy". The meaning of the words is significantly broadened, and so any person, thing, image or idea that is not supportive of

what the community represents is simply marked as unholy. However, it must be highlighted that the words do not become mere synonyms of good and bad. The original meaning closer to expressions such as godly and ungodly remain, and so in the minds of the members of the Christian community, and especially children, this creates a specific set of association. Because to be bad may be disgusting but to be unholy, and this ungodly, or in a sense in opposition to God, is completely abhorrent.

Both systems also make frequent use of mottos, chants and slogans. These to some extent simplify and guide the stream of thought of an individual and their repetition has two functions. Firstly, it helps remember, memorize, and internalize the content of the slogan, secondly, it becomes an automatic response to any statement or sentiment contrary to the slogan. Thus, they become perfect tools of manipulating public as well as personal perception of reality.

The situation in the two books is different in this respect. While in *1984*, the slogans are widely based on oxymoron and apparent contradictions, in *Oranges* the hymns and chants of religious character are only mentioned as something crucial for the course of everyday in the family, but they are not explicitly cited. Very early on in *1984* we learn the basic trio of slogans of Ingsoc: ”WAR IS PEACE, FREEDOM IS SLAVERY, IGNORANCE IS STRENGTH” (4). Throughout the book, the Party presents its ideology in similar short, seemingly contradictory mottos. Even Winston himself, when contemplating the state of matters in his life under the rule of the party, subconsciously writes down the repeating slogan “down with the Big Brother”. *Oranges* are rich in mentioning the mother, community, priest or radio chanting hymns such as Lead Kindly Light, Glorious Things of Thee are spoken, Yield Not to Temptation, Have You Any Room For Jesus, Ask the Saviour to Help You. Even though the form and usage is in each case different and the political system depicted in *1984* is undoubtedly more aggressive and the slogans are absurd, their function is quite similar: to undermine independent thought and simplify it in a radical way. Such slogans also cement the sense of community, which is extremely important in both cases. And thus for both Winston and Jeanette it is almost impossible to function as individuals and their difference renders them noticeable and even ostentatious, although not by their choice.

Both protagonists are also caught in systems completely alienating them from any form of alternative. The systems are carefully built and structured and operate with extreme polarization, a black-and-white distinction between good and evil, fully granted by the authority of the society and its leading figure. The aforementioned logic of holy vs unholy is preceded by a very straightforward division of "Enemies: The Devil (in his many forms), Next Door, Sex (in its many forms), Slugs" and "Friends: God, our dog, Auntie Madge, the Novels of Charlotte Brontë, Slug pellets" (1). As this distinction comes at the very beginning of the book, it serves as a satirical point to start with, but in the light of the story as a whole it is quite an accurate description of the daily run of Jeanette's family. In Orwell, the structure of society is easily graspable, as the distinction is made between the Proles and Party members, various Ministries and Inner and Outer circles of the Party itself.

The alienation or exclusion of Winston from any other part of society but the one he is a firm part of is too apparent to delve into. It is more important to point out how analogous principles are at work in the case of Jeanette. When she wants to visit and buy goods from the two elderly lesbian women (a fact which she does not even recognise herself), she comments: "my mother said firmly and forever, no" (4). When she finally goes to school and the class discusses the past summer holidays, she talks about "how we hired the baths for our baptism service after the Healing of the Sick crusade" (27). Soon, the teachers note that she seems "rather pre-occupied, shall we say, with God" (30). Jeanette is repeatedly forced into realization that she will never be a part of any other kind of community than the religious one. Winterson later notes: "It was obvious where I belonged. Ten more years and I could go to missionary school" (32). Both books work with a strong sense of determination outside of personal will of the protagonists.

While Winterson focuses on anecdotes depicting the inability to cope with the more secular environment, Orwell chooses to describe the world of *1984* more directly, visually, and less personally. While some of the absurdities still connected with the use of language are expressed in an almost ironic way, e.g. the "Victory" goods such as Victory Mansions ("The hallway smelt of boiled cabbage and old rag mats" (3)), Victory Cigarettes (which Winston "incautiously held upright, whereupon the tobacco fell out on to the floor" (8)) or Victory Gin ("It gave off a sickly, oily smell, as of Chinese rice-spirit" (7)), some aspects

are simply described in a more realistic way: “In the far distance a helicopter skimmed down between the roofs, hovered for an instant like a bluebottle, and darted away again with a curving flight. It was the police patrol, snooping into people’s windows” (4). Both approaches create a notion of how exclusive, alienated and tightly controlled the respective environments are.

At this point, it should be clear that the world created around Winston and Jeanette is in both cases very strict, rule-oriented, oblivious of compromise, free thinking or relativity of understanding of good and evil. The worlds of both books do not take into account any possibility of morals derived from the individual as expressed by Emerson, or natural as understood by Kant or Hobbes. The individuality so important for Emerson’s approach is in both cases vigorously diminished, while in the case of *1984* also explicitly criminalized. Even though each of the narratives differ profoundly in the extent of the environment relating to the protagonist (a microcosm in the case of Jeanette’s community and the whole society surrounding Winston), the complete authority of the outer consensus is apparent. While in *Oranges* the realm surrounding Jeanette comes from a very specific, literal interpretation of the Bible, which in this way can support a complete refusal of individual thought, in *1984* it is an openly declared manmade (or Party-made) construct. Jeanette’s mother along with the representatives of the church and community may be perceived as intellectual and practical extensions of St Paul in their strict, uncompromising theology and consequent theocracy. It is St Paul’s total refusal of human effort to grasp the sum of knowledge and understanding collectively called Wisdom. As was shown above, such Wisdom is always and only with God and it must be left as such. The type of thinking represented by this community leaves no space for philosophical inquiry, and the moment Jeanette finds herself in dispute with these principles, she much reminds us of Emerson and his “siding with the Devil” if it matches his personal recognition of good and bad. It should not surprise us that Jeanette and her lover are immediately branded as devilish. Winston’s surroundings are not religious, although the systematic, well-structured adoration of a central figure with its adjacent apparatus of the Party does resemble some aspects of worship of a Deity. Yet, religion in this case is a matter of the pre-war, bourgeois world. Partially we may consider this a completion of what Sam Harris suggests in his notions of a

complete destruction of religion. However, his emphasis on science is hardly similar to the war machinery promoted by the Party in *1984*. According to Harris, science is supposed to free all mankind from bondages of superstition, irrationality, and blind faith. Yet, since completely clear scientific answers to questions in all aspects of human life leave no space for any individual conception of morality, as Harris repeatedly suggests, it is disputable whether such an approach does not open doors for such a sterile, robotized technocracy as depicted in *1984*.

3.3 Antagonists

If Winston Smith and Jeanette are to be called protagonists, who then will be antagonists? Both heroes of the books do have their prominent counterparts who are in a way detrimental to their personal growth, meaning they hamper the florescence of their individualities in a free manner.

In the case of *Oranges*, it is the mother. In the very first chapter, she is described: "She was Old Testament through and through. Not for her the meek and paschal Lamb, she was out there, up front with the prophets, and much given to sulking under trees when the appropriate destruction didn't materialise" (2). The mother is fully dedicated to her beliefs with no regard to anything or anyone else. Every aspect of her life and faith is in a sense brutal and definitely militant. Even her prayers, in some way dialogues with God, are not the commonly understood Christian pleas for Grace and Forgiveness, but rather a very harsh requests for vengeance: "she spoke of her enemies, which was the nearest thing she had to a catechism" (2). The mother also never forgets to remark that vengeance is hers.

Before Jeanette is profoundly changed and excluded from the community for her sexual orientation, her mother has almost complete control over her. Bollinger poins out that the father has "no real role in Jeanette's childhood and appears primarily as a victim of his wife's evangelism. The power of creation rests with Jeanette's mother" (365). Every aspect of Jeanette's life is constructed and determined by the will of the mother. Winterson even notices that the mother "sometimes (…) invented theology" (3). Even though the family, community and all areas of Jeanette's teenage world are most influenced by

Christian values and beliefs, in fact it is the mother who plays the role of an omnipotent God. It is the mother who sets the rules of good and bad, holy and unholy, and who serves as the ultimate ruler. The relationship between her and Jeanette almost completely lacks the intimacy of a child-parent link. When Jeanette is hospitalized with temporal deafness, she tries to reach her mother but does not succeed: "I turned to my mother for support, but she was scribbling me a long letter" (19). The mother does not function solely as a person, but rather a personification of a set of rules and principles. It may be said that she fails as a mother. Yet as was mentioned above, Jeanette is still drawn towards her, no matter what happens.

Bollinger compares this with the biblical story of Ruth. Again, the environment of evangelical Protestantism shifts the values of good and evil in a thorough way, and so "Ruth's loyalty to Naomi, and by extension perhaps female loyalty in general, becomes the noblest action possible, worthy of imitation even by God" (371). It is a kind of loyalty not reciprocated, not conditioned by any preceding act of kindness, it is simply loyalty in itself. Bollinger continues with the original Hebrew word "hesed" meaning loyalty, duty, mercy, goodness, and kindness, and many more, and explains that "perfect loyalty between women sets the standard for divine mercy. While this model of perfection may harm Jeanette's ability to form romantic attachments, it does enable her to return to her mother to continue their relationship" (371).

An interesting comparison emerges when we once again focus on the story of the sorceress Winnet, who in a parable represents Jeanette. When Winnet escapes from the realm of the sorcerer (the parental figure in the actual story represented by the mother), she never comes back because it is clear to her that she cannot. This may be yet another Jeanette's phantasy, but in reality of the book she does come back, or better stated: she always come back. Even as the book reaches its conclusion, the power the mother holds over Jeanette is not exactly diminished, it rather seems almost permanent.

Similarly, throughout *1984* Winston Smith is subject to the power of O'Brien. From their very first encounter, there is something attractive about him appealing to Winston: "O'Brien was a large, burly man with a thick neck and a coarse, humorous, brutal face. In spite of his formidable appearance he had a certain charm of manner" (14). Repeatedly

appearing in Winston's dreams, he gradually lures Winston into the trap of a sham rebellion and finally personally presides the torture and ultimate destruction of Winston's personality. Yet in a very similar manner, up until the very end, Winston finds an eerie sense of trust and security in him and even when tortured almost personally by O'Brien, he turns to him for reassurance.

As a result, the most terrifying aspect of the antagonists in both *Oranges* and *1984* is their absolute power over the protagonists, their ability to repeatedly draw them to themselves, and undermine their own perception of good and evil, moral and immoral. In the final chapter of the practical part of this thesis, we will learn what techniques are used to corrupt and destroy such a perception in Jeanette and Winston.

3.4 Brainwashing techniques

Both in *Oranges* and *1984* the protagonist finally gets to a point where the offence – in Winston's case the free thinking and disbelief in the doctrines of the Party, in Jeanette's case her love for another woman – becomes evident and the protagonist is punished.

This is the part where is finally becomes evident how important the moral clash between the individual and the society is. In both cases, the punishment is carried out on moral grounds. The personal perception of morality is questioned and relativized, and consequently a consensual, mass understanding is put into direct opposition. The individual is not allowed to even keep their own understanding to themselves, the representatives of the majority (O'Brien, the mother, priests) feel they must completely eradicate the original set of ideas in the individual.

In *Oranges*, the sentiment of eradication of individual thought flows throughout the whole story but the part that shows the technique being used in full perhaps for the first time is at the sermon where the lesbian relationship of Jeanette and Melanie is revealed. The pastor claims that Jeanette and her lover, Melanie, "have fallen under Satan's spell", further they "have fallen foul of their lusts", and "are full of demons" (78). At this point, the teenage girl tries to defend herself, even using Bible citations ("To the pure all things are pure" (79)) but to no avail. At this point, she is left with two possibilities: to fight the

community on biblical grounds, which is destined to be a fruitless effort, or to give up. Further reassurance for the ultraconservative, literal reading of the Scripture may be mentioned here to show under which circumstances Jeanette would have been if she wanted to rebel. “I will destroy the wisdom of the wise, and bring to nothing the understanding of the prudent” (1 Cor, 1:19). If such a clear statement (along with the aforementioned citations in the Theoretical Part) is interpreted literally, then there is no justification for Jeanette’s actions, for her lesbianism, or her freethinking. She never means to leave the faith, she never really doubts her God but none of it is good enough, unless she obeys fully and flawlessly. In the atmosphere of the evangelical church there is no space for personality, no room for individuality. Many interpreters understand the main duty of a Christian to be full dedication to the will of God, a state of complete selflessness. Yet, God is represented by the Scripture which is interpreted by the church. This succession obviously deletes individuality and leaves but one ultimate truth. And thus after such horrendous accusations have been thrown at Jeanette, the church is immediately filled with horror. What worse accusation can there be in a radically Christian environment that of being possessed and filled with demons?

Both the Party in *1984* and the Christian community in *Oranges* emphasize the sentiment that consensual wisdom (and morality) is always more important while the individual perception is somewhat demonic or self-idolizing. While the pastor informs Jeanette that the church will “help her” (79) since she cannot help herself, O’Brien goes a step further and explains to Winston that even in death, the individual has no value, “the Party is immortal” (243). The individual is nothing but a cell in an organism which can in the end function quite well with the cell absent.

To a certain extent, the arguments presented by O’Brien may be understood as a distorted, overturned version of Kant’s Categorical Imperative. While Kant demands that every person behave in such a manner that it may become a universal law, O’Brien requires Winston (and at least all Party members) to behave, act and think is a manner that in itself is the universal law of the Party. And yet another aspect of O’Brien’s logic resembles Kant: the sum of rules governing the society of *1984* is in most cases not written down. The citizen is not required to obey the law, memorize and internalize a list of commandments

(as may be the case of Jeanette's Christian community in *Oranges*), but live and exist according to a codex that is fully axiomatic or almost natural. Quite like Kant, O'Brien does not connect the decision to act "correctly" to a conscious decision but stresses an underlying yet obvious pattern in any individual. The ultimate outcome of this philosophy is in each case of course completely contrary, as while Kant requires every human simply to act according to their best conscience, O'Brien emphasizes eradication of all conscience.

Also, logic and rationality is systematically and unceasingly attacked in both cases while the logic of the majority is immediately implemented. A good example is the verbal exchange between Jeanette and the pastor. While she states that it is perfectly possible for one to love God and another human being and the same time and with the same vigor ("Yes, I love both of them" (79)), the pastor claims it is not so ("You cannot" (79)). Her point of view is never met with understanding or respect. Her logic is supposedly broken and irrational. Winston has to face such odds likewise. Here, this aspect of denial of his individuality is more vivid and extreme. O'Brien simply tells him that two plus two not only is not four but it can be three or four, whatever the Party wishes is to be. There is no truth but the truth created by the Party. Since Winston considers this an absurd, unnatural, artificial logic, during one of the torture sessions he tries to explain that the "spirit of Man" (340) will prevail and break the Party. O'Brien explains to Winston that there is no such thing as Man, and if so, Winston is the last of the kind, and further plays down Winston's value as a human being ("You are rotting away,' he said; 'you are falling to pieces. What are you? A bag of filth" (343).). This part demonstrates that whatever Winston consideres natural, universally valid and true may be easily destroyed in a most meticulous and precise way. A consensus breaks even the laws of physics, as O'Brien shows him. For Winston's innate, personal understanding of ethics and morality there is no basis, everything is easily shifted and broken if the Party wishes so.

Zimbardo notes that during the course of Winston's torture, Orwell asks "some of the most profound questions about human existence. What is reality? What is truth?" He also ask about the "most vital qualities of the human psyche". The individuality and independence is further problematized as he asks whether "an individual can survive in an inhospitable environment without the tangible support of a social group, family and friends,

or the spiritual support of a religious-mythical ideology" (129). O'Brien systematically constructs a negative answer. The individual is nothing, the personal understanding of reality, morality, and truth is nothing. The individual mind does not even exist.

In both books it is shown that for an individual caught in an authoritarian society based firm rules and with a strong and charismatic leader or representative, it is almost impossible to uphold one's own moral code. Not only does any verbal or visible expression of such a notion create an extremely hostile and destructive reaction on the part of the majority, but even a fully personal following of one's own principles is in time detected, exposed, and punished.

4. Conclusion

As has been shown in both the Theoretical and Practical Parts of this thesis, there is not simple answer to the question of where to look for a moral code. Both George Orwell's *1984* and Jeanette Winterson's *Oranges Are Not the Only Fruit* present stories of partially involuntary rebels who find themselves in the midst of opposite-minded majority. Both books show us that there is hardly any chance of mutual respect, understanding or consent. While at the very end of the story every part of Winston Smith's personality ends up "dead", Jeanette is forced to leave her own home and live on her own.

The focus of this work was not on the story of the books, nor have all characters, symbols or episodes been discussed. Only passages or motifs relevant to the topic have been chosen to create a systematic, understandable space for describing the general idea of this thesis.

It was not the aim of this work to side with any of the authors cited in the theoretical part or to choose whether any of the protagonists was correct in their personal interpretation of goodness or badness. The ultimate goal of this thesis was to show that the topic of the clash of innate and consensual ethics is a firm, inseparable topic of the Western tradition and that both *1984* and *Oranges Are Not the Only Fruit* work with these categories and thus enrich the never ending debate.

It should be now evident how the stress put on individuality and a conception of

moral rooted in every person alone represented by Emerson is in complete contrast with both of the authoritarian systems depicted in the books. We have seen a distorted version of Kant's Categorical Imperative becoming an Imperative of Selflessness in *1984*. Further, we have seen considerable emphasis put on selflessness in *Oranges*, as any sign of more personal understanding of morality, the Scripture and God is destroyed by the mother and the priest. In both cases the protagonist is required to become one with the society or community. Both societies are based on a notion of perfection. While in the case of *Orange*s, this perfection seemingly imitates God and His ultimate plans for all humanity (even though we learn that perhaps the most human desires and needs such as love and pursuit of freedom are not allowed to be freely displayed), in 1984 religion and any form of transcendence (except perhaps for the hysterical love for the Party and the Big Brother) is banned and eliminated. This perfection, of course, is yet another piece of a consensus, more or less vividly forced upon the protagonists. Both books present the clash of innate and consensual ethics through the clash of the protagonists and the systems they relate to. In both cases the conception of innate ethics is represented by the "rebelling" hero, while a consensus, or the understanding of the majority is forced upon them. Ultimately, to a certain extent both individualistic moral concepts of the protagonists reach their destruction under the weight of the consensus, as, partially, the protagonists do themselves.

As both Winston and Jeanette are unstable, rather weak and vulnerable characters, the authors themselves show their indecision and uncertainty in this area. Rather than choosing a conclusive answer, they both show how lost they are in the topic. This "lostness" is the overall sentiment represented by this work as well. Even though many may agree with Sam Harris in his conviction that one day science will be able to determine with precision what is moral and what is not, let us conclude this thesis with the question unanswered and bemused quite like Winston and Jeanette.

Works Cited:

Bollinger, Laura. "The Biblical Ruth in Jeanette Winterson's Oranges Are Not the Only Fruit." *Tulsa Studies in Women's Literature* 1994. 363-380. Ebook.

Ellam, Julie. "Jeanette Winterson's Family Values: From "Oranges Are Not the Only Fruit to Lighthousekeeping"." *Critical Survey* 2006. 79-88. Ebook.

Emerson, Ralph Waldo. Self-Reliance. Emerson Central, 4 September 2009. Web. 22 June 2015.

Harris, Sam. The Moral Landscape. New York: Free Press, 2010. Ebook.

Hobbes, Thomas. Leviathan. University of Oregon, 12 April 2005. Web. 11 March 2015.

Kant, Immanuel. Groundwork for the metaphysics of morals. New York: Vail-Ballou Press, 2002. Ebook.

The King James Version. BibleGateway.com. Web. 9 February 2015.

Zimbardo, Phillip G. "Mind Control in Orwell's Nineteen Eighty-Four: Finctional Concepts Become Operational Realities in Jim Jones's Jungle Experiment." *On Nineteen Eighty-Four: Orwell and Our Future*. Ed. Gleason, Abbott, Goldsmith, Jack, Nussbaum, Martha C. Princeton University Press, 2005. 127-154. Ebook.